

SENATE—Thursday, May 4, 2000

The Senate met at 9:45 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Sovereign God, ultimate ruler of this Nation, the one to whom we are joined with millions of Americans across the land in humble repentance on this National Day of Prayer, we know that repentance is confessing our needs and returning to You. In so many ways we have drifted from You, Holy Father. Forgive us when we neglect our spiritual heritage as a Nation. Help us when we become dulled in our accountability to You and the moral absolutes of Your commandments. Without absolute righteousness, morality, honesty, integrity, and faithfulness, our society operates in frivolous situational ethics while the prosperity of our times camouflages the poverty of the soul of our Nation.

May this day of prayer be the beginning of a great spiritual awakening. Wake us up to the realization that all we have and are is Your gift. Draw us back into a relationship of graceful trust in You that will make our motto "In God We Trust" not just a slogan but a profound expression of our dependence on You to guide and bless this Nation. We confess our false pride and express our full praise. Today we renew our commitment to You as Lord of this land and of our personal lives. Hear the urgent prayers of Your people and bring us back home to Your heart where we belong.

Today, gracious God, we join the Nation in mourning the death of John Cardinal O'Connor. We thank You for his leadership, for his prophetic powers, and for his obedience to follow You in social justice.

Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable MIKE CRAPO, a Senator from the State of Indiana, led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The acting majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, today the Senate will immediately begin consid-

eration of the Abraham-Mack amendment regarding merit pay for teachers. Following that debate, Senator MURRAY will be recognized to offer her amendment regarding class size. No time agreements have been made with regard to these amendments, and therefore votes will occur at a time to be determined in the future. Senators will be notified as votes are scheduled.

The Senate will not be in session tomorrow. However, it is expected that debate on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act will continue next week.

I thank my colleagues for their attention.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ABRAHAM. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 2, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2) to extend programs and activities under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

AMENDMENT NO. 3117

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of Senator MACK, myself, and Senator COVERDELL, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. ABRAHAM], for himself, Mr. MACK, and Mr. COVERDELL, proposes amendment numbered 3117.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I have a unanimous-consent request regarding debate on this amendment. I think we will probably go back and forth, but on the Democratic side, after Senator KENNEDY and Senator MURRAY speak, I ask unanimous consent I follow them in sequence as we alternate back and forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, my assumption is that the unanimous-consent agreement that was entered into and envisioned, we would alternate between sides if there are speakers on each side, but that it would govern the order in which the Democratic side speakers would address the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the Chair's understanding. The Chair, under the unanimous-consent request, will alternate between sides. The speakers on the Democratic side are Senator KENNEDY, Senator MURRAY, and Senator WELLSTONE, in that order.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, title II of the bill before the Senate today includes a provision called the Teacher Employment Act—or TEA. This provision combines the current ESEA, title II, Eisenhower Professional Development Program and the class-size reduction program, for a total of \$2 billion, which is then made available to states and local education agencies for teacher development programs.

Our amendment would amend the TEA provision—and expand the scope of allowable uses of title II professional development funds to allow states and local education agencies to use these funds for the development and implementation of teacher testing, merit-based pay, and tenure reform programs.

Mr. President, I believe that a qualified, highly trained, and highly motivated teacher is the key to a quality education for America's children. Most of our colleagues would agree.

Teachers play a special and indispensable role in our children's education. Nothing can replace the positive and long-lasting impact a dedicated, knowledgeable teacher has on a child's learning process.

The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future found that while class size reduction has the least impact on increasing student achievement and that teacher-education—teacher quality—has the most impact on student achievement.

Our amendment is designed to improve the quality of our teachers. It puts into practice the common sense we all share—the sense that teachers

should be trained in the area they teach, that outstanding teachers should be rewarded, and that a teacher's promotion should be based not just on longevity but on performance.

Let me explain why I believe this amendment is important. First, I believe that teachers should know the subject matter they teach. Unfortunately, this is not always the case in many classrooms around the country. According to the Department of Education, one-third of high school math teachers, nearly 25 percent of high school English teachers and 20 percent of science teachers, are teaching without a college major or minor in their subjects. Teacher testing allows school districts to better target those teachers in need of additional professional development. By pinpointing the strengths and weaknesses of teachers, schools will be able to place teachers in their area of specialty and help those teachers in need of additional professional development.

A recent study, using student math scores on the Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program for two large Tennessee metropolitan area school systems, at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville ranked teachers based on five objective rankings of effectiveness. By the fifth grade, students who had studied under "highly ineffective" teachers averaged 54 to 60 points lower on achievement tests than students who had spent the 3 years with "highly effective" teachers.

I believe that States and local districts should be allowed to use Federal funds for teacher testing programs to determine which teachers are effective, and for which teachers additional professional development would be of assistance.

Second, I believe that outstanding teachers should be rewarded with merit-based pay increases. Teachers who motivate and inspire their students and put forth the extra effort to improve and expand their own skills should be rewarded. In the business world, employees who go the extra mile and exceed expectations are financially rewarded for their dedication and hard work. Are teachers, tasked with educating and shaping our children lives and futures, any less deserving of merit-based pay rewards?

Merit-based pay would reward teachers for exceptional teaching—providing added incentive to excel at a demanding and challenging profession. A senior associate at the Educational Trust, an advocacy group for the poor, once referred to high-poverty schools as boot camps for teachers.

Shouldn't there be the option of rewarding teachers who choose to take the more difficult path or who inspire less advantaged students to perform at a level well above that of their peers? I believe every one of us understands that teachers do, indeed, deserve these

rewards. And, what is more, our kids deserve the improved educational experience such rewards will produce. Finally, I believe that teachers should be promoted to higher positions based on performance and subject expertise, not just on the longevity of their tenure.

Tenure reform ensures teachers will be held accountable for their overall performance in the classroom. According to U.S. News and World Report, the presiding officer's own State of Kentucky's tenure reforms—which includes exhaustive performance evaluations of teachers and schools and accountability for poorly performing teachers and administrators—have dramatically improved many of that State's worst performing schools. All of these reforms can vastly improve the quality of instruction in the classroom, which will provide students with the educational tools necessary to succeed in this new demanding economy they confront. I believe we ought to permit the States and local districts to use federal funds to design, develop, and implement these reforms—should they decide to do so.

Now let me now explain what this amendment does and does not do. It permits—and I stress word "permits"—states and localities to use these funds for teacher testing, merit pay, or tenure reform programs. It does not mandate or require them to set up these programs—nor does it penalize them if they choose not to. It gives States and localities the freedom to decide precisely how these programs should be designed and how they should be administered. It does not require the States and local districts to do anything with the information gathered from testing or which tests to be used. Nor would they be required to base merit pay decisions on the outcome of the teacher tests. This amendment does not dictate that Federal funds must be used for tenure reform or establish criteria for such reform. Again, it only permits States and local districts to use funds for those purposes if they choose, based on how they choose.

While it could be argued that teacher testing, tenure reform, and merit-pay programs are already permissible uses under the Teachers Empowerment Act provision, we believe that explicitly listing these programs would eliminate any uncertainty among the states and local districts, granting them the freedom to full develop and implement the programs which will best target their specific needs in teacher professional development. This amendment is based in the same principles as the legislation that passed the Senate last Congress with bipartisan support by a vote of 63–35.

In conclusion, I would like to recognize a very simple fact. We in Washington too often focus on these issues from simply a national perspective. I think this debate we have had over the

last few days clearly focuses on the important, critical role States and especially local school districts must play in the development of quality education in our Nation.

This amendment is designed to give even more flexibility to the States and the local districts to use these Federal funds for programs that we believe can help to improve their quality. There are no mandates. This is simply a permissible use that we would be providing.

In summary, we think this legislation can be improved by the amendment. We look forward to hearing discussion on it today. We believe it is important to reward quality teachers of this country for their commitment to ensure our children will be taught by the most qualified and knowledgeable individuals available.

I will have more to say on this as we go forward. I know there are other Senators wishing to address the issue. I note the presence of Senators MACK, WELLSTONE, and KENNEDY, so I yield the floor and I will speak again at a later point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNNING). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, generally around here if there is someone who is proposing the amendment, they are recognized to make opening comments. I understand there is a cosponsor on that. I think they should be entitled to also make opening comments. We will be glad to hear from the other cosponsor of the amendment if he would like to speak first.

Mr. MACK. I am glad to let my colleague go first.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I will just make a brief opening comment. I want to start off by mentioning where we are on the issue of teacher training and teacher enhancement that is being addressed by my good friend from Michigan. Under the Republican bill, there is \$2 billion for teacher quality and class size—that is a total of \$2 billion. Included in that, is \$1.3 billion which is presently allocated for the class size reduction program that has been implemented for 2 years in a row. Therefore, the 29,000 teachers teaching today in grades 1, 2, and 3, who are getting paid out of class size reduction program funds, will effectively be receiving pink slips because the Republicans are taking that program's money and putting it into the Republican bill.

Second, part of that \$2 billion is the \$350 million that is currently being used in math and science professional development across the country. The \$350 million program, named after President Eisenhower, helps local schools to develop the capability of math and science teachers. It has been a good program and is working effectively around the country.

So, the Republicans want to wipe out the new teachers who have been hired for the first, second, and third grade; they want to end the Eisenhower math and science professional development program.

On the other hand, our total proposal on the Democrat side is \$3.75 billion. We have \$2 billion which is for professional development, mentoring and recruitment, and \$1.75 billion for class size reduction. We had, as part of our debate yesterday, included our \$3.75 billion in the democratic substitute. Last evening, I reviewed what we did in our particular proposal and the guarantees we provided for teacher quality and education. We made sure in our amendment that there was going to be a guarantee of funds for professional development. The other side only mentions "a portion of funds for professional development". It is ironic to hear my friends talk about the importance of professional development, when they barely target any funds in their existing bill for professional development. "A portion can be spent."

Furthermore, their bill does not guarantee any funds for mentoring programs, which we all know are so important and effective for retaining teachers.

We find the turnover of teachers serving in title I underserved areas averages 50 to 60 percent in 4 years as compared to those who have mentoring, which can make a great deal of difference to teachers. Their amendment does not address the issue of how to resolve the high turnover rate issue. It does not guarantee that teachers are going to get special skills to help students with disabilities or limited English proficiency. It does not give priority to developing math and science training programs.

When all is said and done, our Republican friends have come up with nothing to ensure that a certain amount of these funds go for professional development, mentoring programs, recruitment programs—activities we know are proven to improve teacher quality and retention.

We were anticipating, maybe unrealistically so, that in the areas that are tried, tested, and true, such as enhanced teacher training in the classroom, that our friends were going to come up with something. Basically, what they came up with is merit pay and testing of teachers. We have listened carefully to what the Senator stated. We are, as I mentioned, somewhat interested in the fact that these are the two areas.

In looking through the studies and reports of incentives for teachers to advance their capability of academic achievement and results, the cumulative studies are very compelling and are rather common sense.

Obviously, the academic background of the teacher's expertise is enor-

mously important. But, we still are finding out that of the more than 50,000 teachers who were hired this past year, the majority of those serving in high-poverty areas are not fully qualified. We need to do something about this. We find there is a higher turnover rate in high-poverty schools. We know that if the schools want to hold on to new teachers, mentoring by experienced teachers, is effective. Studies have shown this.

Also, it is very evident that there ought to be continuing education and professional development for all teachers. As the information comes in and more studies are conducted, it is clear that professional development ought to take place not outside the school but in the classrooms and schools.

These are the models which have had the greatest success in ensuring all of our teachers are of the highest quality. For those who are not going to measure up, after evaluations and professional development, they ought to be given their fair due in terms of a hearing, but then moved out of the educational system.

That is what we believe, that is for what we stand, and that is included in our educational provisions. Those are the issues that we feel are important.

I ask the Senator whether he knows of any States that have embarked on a merit pay program.

Mr. ABRAHAM. My understanding is States have experimented with merit pay programs since the 1960s. I can recall in the late 1960s when I was an intern working in the education office of the Governor of Michigan, we were looking at various experimental programs, learning from models from places such as North Carolina and other States that were experimenting with those programs.

It seems to me this is not a new proposal at all. It is one with which various States have experimented and employed in different ways for a long time. That was my first experience with it, I think in 1969, 1970.

Mr. KENNEDY. I asked the question because last night I tried to find out which States have merit pay programs, and I was unable to find any.

Currently, there is nothing prohibiting States from implementing merit pay programs. If it is so successful, I would have thought we would have had several States already doing it and demonstrated that it has improved student achievement.

I can give the Senator a number of places where it has been tried and dropped. In Fairfax County, VA, they developed a merit pay program in the last few years, but the program was dropped.

I am all for incentives for teachers who move ahead in their academic achievements and accomplishments. We ought to provide incentives to encourage professional development and

more advanced degrees. I am all for schools that are able to move ahead, and for giving flexibility to the States and the educational districts to provide financial incentives to do that. But in the areas where we are talking about rifleshot programs, which this amendment does, for particular individuals—I can, probably like the good Senator from Washington, Mrs. MURRAY, think of teachers who are teaching in some of the toughest schools in Boston, in Holyoke, MA, and in a number of other communities, who are showing up every day, working hard, facing extraordinary challenges where almost a third of all the children attending those schools are coming from homes where there is either physical abuse or substance abuse. They deserve combat pay.

But that isn't what this is really about. This is about individuals and principals giving individual financial incentives. What we want to try to do is to make available—at least on our side—the kinds of financial resources available to local communities, for whole school reform.

I know the other side believes that States should have block grants—blank checks—but we want to support tried and tested programs that have worked.

I have a very interesting study here that was just completed by the National Commission on Teaching & America's Future, the Consortium for Policy Research in Education. A review of 65 studies of science teaching concluded that teachers' effectiveness in teaching science depends on the amount and kind of teacher education, disciplinary training, and the professional development opportunities they experience later in their careers.

That is what we should have, the continuing, ongoing availability and requirement that there is going to be a continuing upgrading of the skills of teachers. That is what they want.

What we have seen to be a strong determinant of teacher effectiveness stems from the quality of the teacher's initial teaching education and certification, and, second, later, professional development. Studies done over the last few years have shown this to be true.

In listening to our colleague speak, I was just trying to find out where his programs have been effective.

I yield at this time and then will come back to the issue. There are others who want to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, let me make just a couple of comments before I give my prepared remarks.

It is interesting how this debate is being engaged rather vigorously so quickly and so early this morning. I remind my colleagues that this is basically this same amendment that was adopted by the Senate 63-35 in the last Congress.

I imagine the reason for it is that all of my colleagues received a letter from the National Education Association, the teachers union, in opposition to this amendment. This letter from the National Education Association on behalf of its 2.5 million members strongly urges opposition to the amendment offered by Senator ABRAHAM and myself. They are opposed to it because it authorizes "federal funds for [the purpose of] testing of current teachers, tenure reform, and merit pay."

I find it interesting that the NEA previously came out in support of testing—NEA President Bob Chase has said the NEA:

... wholeheartedly supports and endorses the recommendations of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future's new report, "Doing What Matters Most: Investing in Quality Teaching."

The report recommends: Teachers should be licensed based on demonstrated performance, including tests of subject matter knowledge, teaching knowledge, and teaching skill.

The report recommends: To encourage and reward teacher knowledge and skill, we should develop a career continuum for teaching linked to assessments and compensation systems that reward knowledge and skill.

That sounds to me like a broad endorsement of the concept of testing teachers to understand where they are with respect to the knowledge they have in the courses they are going to be teaching. I think it clearly indicates the idea of moving away from pay being based on someone's seniority to one based on merit—pay should be based on the ability to teach, the ability to be able to show, in testing, that they have the knowledge in the areas in which they are teaching.

So I make that comment to begin.

Further, with respect to questions about merit pay, again, my colleague already referred to the fact there have been States experimenting with this idea since the late 1960s. But Denver, CO, has a merit pay system. Interestingly enough, the Secretary of Education, Secretary Riley, when he was Governor of South Carolina, endorsed merit pay.

In Florida, we encourage teachers to participate in what I believe is the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. If a teacher in the State of Florida successfully completes that process and becomes certified by this board, they are going to receive a bonus. I think that is merit pay.

So this idea that I think the Senator from Massachusetts tried to imply, that this is something no one is pursuing and there is no value to it, I would say, is not accurate.

Mr. President, I rise today with my friend and colleague, Senator ABRAHAM, to offer this critically important amendment. It focuses on the single most important, yet most overlooked,

aspect of education—the quality of America's teachers.

Education is the engine of social and economic progress, and the ladder of opportunity. The rungs of that ladder must be supported by exceptional teachers. I have little doubt that the American spirit of ingenuity and innovation will continue to lead the world in providing new economic opportunities, expanding medical research and improving the quality of life for everyone. But there is a catch. For our children and grandchildren to achieve the high standards we expect of them, we must provide them with the tools they need to help them excel. The economic security of our children depends upon the quality of their education.

Each time we debate education reform in America, there is a growing sentiment that continued viability of the American dream could slip away simply because our children are unprepared to face tomorrow's challenges. The academic performance of America's students in international exams can hardly be considered world class. In fact, the longer our students attend American schools, the further behind they fall in performance. Consider these statistics:

While America's 4th graders score above the international average in math tests, they continue to trail students in countries like Austria, the Czech Republic, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, the Netherlands, and Singapore. By the 8th grade, American students barely meet the international average, and by the 12th grade, American students lag far behind their international peers.

In science, U.S. students score above the international average in both 4th and 8th grades. But, in 4th grade, U.S. students are outranked by only one country—Korea. By the 8th grade, thirteen countries outrank U.S. students.

Again, that is an indication that the longer they are in school, the further behind they fall with other countries in the world.

In international physics tests, American 12th graders ranked sixteenth, and far behind countries like Russia, Slovenia, Latvia and the Czech Republic.

In both math and science, the performance of U.S. 12th graders is among the lowest in the industrialized world. Of the 21 countries that participate, the United States placed 16th in science and 19th in math skills.

Our students will be denied basic opportunities because they have not been adequately equipped to face a new, competitive, and global economy. We can and must do better.

Without qualified teachers in America's classrooms, all other attempts at reform are meaningless. We have long focused on the need to hire more teachers—as many as two million over the next decade. Our focus shouldn't be on the number of teachers, but rather, on the quality of those teachers.

As long as students are compelled to attend school, we should be compelled to staff those schools with the best and brightest teachers. Parents all over the state of Florida, and I imagine the same is true around the country, are concerned that the success—or failure—of their child's entire academic year will be determined by the quality and expertise of their child's teacher. Studies show that the most important factor in determining student success on standardized tests is the teacher's ability to present the material. As States are taking important steps to challenge their students with high-stakes tests for promotion and graduation, we must encourage states to step up to the plate and provide students with teachers who are better prepared than ever before.

Further complicating the situation is the shortage of teachers nationwide, which has led many school districts to assign teachers to subjects for which they have no formal training. Four million American students are currently being taught English, Math, or History by teachers who have neither a college major or minor in the subject they are teaching. Four million kids!

Mr. President, maybe I have a slightly different perspective in looking at these numbers today than I would have, say, 5 or 6 weeks ago. Priscilla and I were just blessed with our first granddaughter. We already have three grandsons, but this is our first granddaughter. While all of us in the family are engaged in the early days of raising that little baby and trying to get through the night, we are also concerned about the future for little Addison. Is she going to be among the one out of five students in America being taught English by a teacher who doesn't have a major or minor in English?

Think about that for a moment. I think one out of four math students are being taught by teachers who do not have a minor or major in that subject. So when I think about little Addison's future, and I realize the competitive world in which we live today, and how much more competitive it is going to be in the future, I know she is not going to be able to compete and have the same opportunities we all have enjoyed if she doesn't have an education second to none. Frankly, that can only come about as a result of having high-quality teachers in the classroom—teachers who my son and his wife, Ann, can be comfortable in knowing have the knowledge and expertise to provide that education.

Requiring secondary school teachers to earn a major or minor in their subjects might make sense if there were not a clearly superior policy that could be adopted instead, such as requiring teachers to pass a subject knowledge test for the subject areas they teach.

Teacher testing is an important first step toward upgrading the quality of

instruction in the classroom. Testing provides a valuable opportunity for teachers to demonstrate knowledge of subjects for which they do not hold a major or minor degree. It will also enable principals to evaluate their staffing needs and to staff classrooms with the most qualified teachers. You simply can not teach what you don't know.

Common sense also dictates that we should not focus solely on underperforming teachers. We must also recognize that there are many great teachers who are successfully challenging their students on a daily basis. Teaching is one of the most important and challenging professions. While many excellent, enthusiastic, and well prepared teachers already work in America's schools, their work often goes unrecognized and unrewarded. Salaries for teachers lag far behind other professions for which a college degree is expected or required, and as a result, many exceptional teachers leave the profession and others who would be exceptional teachers never even consider teaching.

We have created a system of clear incentives for our best teachers to leave the classroom. Instead, we should be enacting policies to keep the best and brightest teachers in the classroom. To do this, we need to evaluate and reward teachers with a compensation system that supports and encourages them to strengthen their skills and demonstrate high levels of performance. That, in turn, will enhance learning for all children.

Today, schools compensate teachers based almost solely on seniority, not on their performance inside the classroom. It rewards underperforming teachers and penalizes exceptional ones by grouping them together in a single pay scale based primarily upon length of service. Merit-pay would differentiate between teachers who are hardworking and inspiring, and those who fall short. It is true that good teachers cost money. But the fact is, bad teachers can cost more because they limit the education of a child and his or her ability to contribute to society.

We hear quite often that merit pay won't work in public schools because it is too difficult to compare the accomplishments between teachers teaching smart, wealthy, well-disciplined, well-fed children versus those teaching poor, inattentive, hungry and unruly children. These conditions are no different than the differences faced by other professionals like doctors or lawyers who face both unwinnable cases or deadly diseases. Teachers should also be rewarded proportionately to their accomplishments in enhancing student learning, attitudes, and behavior.

This is not to suggest that simply throwing more money at schools and teachers will rescue schools from mediocrity. Some suggest we try throwing more money at the problem, although I

would point out that we have already tried that. The United States spends more money per pupil than any other industrialized nation, and as I mentioned earlier, our children are not achieving high levels of performance on international standardized exams. The reality is that no amount of money will save mismanaged, bureaucratic, red-tape ridden schools from failure. And no amount of money will rescue a student who is placed in a classroom led by an unprepared, unenthusiastic, and uninspiring teacher. This debate is less about money and more about giving teachers a greater stake in the education they provide. We can do this by offering them real incentives to do their best so that their dedication and expertise will be recognized and rewarded. This will benefit all students.

Our amendment, known as the MERIT Act, will enable states to use their limited federal dollars on a number of initiatives to enhance teacher quality. First, this amendment provides funding for states to develop rigorous exams to periodically test elementary and secondary school teachers on their knowledge of the subjects they are teaching. Secondly, this amendment provides funding to states to establish compensation systems for teachers based upon merit and proven performance. Finally, this amendment provides states with resources to reform current tenure programs.

This broad approach will enable states to staff their schools with the best and most qualified teachers, thereby enhancing learning for all students. In turn, teachers can be certain that all of their energy, dedication and expertise will be rewarded. And it will be done without placing new mandates on states or increasing the federal bureaucracy.

Last Congress, the Senate passed a similar amendment with bipartisan support by a vote of 63-35 during debate on the Education Savings Account legislation. Unfortunately, the President vetoed that bill, despite his previous support for teacher testing.

I look forward to working with my colleagues as we continue the fight to give dedicated professionals, who teach our children, a personal stake in the quality of the instruction they provide. I hope there will again be broad, bipartisan support for this amendment. I thank the chair and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I was going to ask a question of the Senator from Florida. I am not trying to speak. Will the Senator yield for that?

Mrs. MURRAY. I will yield for a quick question.

Mr. COVERDELL. When the Senator from Florida brought this amendment to the floor, he was talking about an

experience in Los Angeles at a school. In deference to the Senator from Washington, I want to keep it brief, but I wonder if he could allude to that briefly.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, that is a story I remember very well. To cut it short takes away, I think, the strength of its message. So maybe a little bit later on in the debate we can discuss it, but I would be glad to yield the time back to the Senator so she can continue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, on our side, I ask unanimous consent that Senator WELLSTONE be followed by Senator DORGAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senators from Michigan and Florida for addressing an issue I think all of us really need to address; that is, how do we recruit and retain good teachers in our classrooms today?

I think all of us whose kids are in public schools want to know our child will go to school and get the best teacher in that school. The question before us is, How do we make that happen? How do we ensure every one of our kids gets a really good teacher?

I have to say I am disappointed in the proposal our colleagues on the other side of the aisle came up with on merit pay. We have heard a lot of slogans in this debate. So far, from the other side, we have heard about private school vouchers, block grants, and now we are getting merit pay and testing for teachers. They all sound really good.

But I assure my colleagues, as someone who has been a teacher, someone who has been a school board member, someone who served in the State legislature, slogans don't teach kids; they don't keep good teachers in our classrooms; they don't improve test scores.

We are right in looking at the question of how we assure that we have good teachers. I was on a school board. I have debated the issue of merit pay, which, by the way, school districts can now do and which State legislatures can now do.

As a Senator, I ask you to give us an example of a current school district that has merit pay in place that is working. We have not heard of any. I will tell you why. Because when you get down to the question of what does merit pay really do and you start to look at it, you realize that merit pay doesn't accomplish what we really want in ensuring that all of our kids get a good education.

Good current educational policy and curriculum standards are what we want to teach our kids today. It is not how to sit at a desk, listen to an adult,

do everything right all day long, and not move but, rather, how to work together in teams and how to work together with other students because that is what is required of them when they get into the workforce. Very few jobs today have a single person sitting at a desk doing the same task all day long.

Merit rewards an individual teacher pitted against another teacher rather than encouraging teachers to work together in their building to improve the education of all of our children.

That is what we are trying to teach our children. The best way to do that is by example—encouraging teachers in a building to work together. Certainly different teachers in every building have different skills. Certainly some of them do better with one child, or another child, or another curriculum piece.

We must encourage everyone to work together rather than saying we are going to pick the best three or four of you and give you an extra incentive; we encourage a teacher to come and be the principal's pet, or to be there to work the longest, or to try to show that they are somehow better than the other teachers. You start getting teachers pitted against each other. That is not what we want in a good school building. We want all the teachers supporting each other.

The best schools I have been in are ones where all of the first grade teachers get together after school, or support each other throughout the day, or share their curriculum. Who is going to share their curriculum, or share the good things that work in their classroom, if that means they may not be the teacher who gets the merit pay? That is why school boards and States have not enacted merit pay. It is simply another slogan we put out here.

I think we really need to concentrate on what works. How can we ensure that we recruit the best and brightest? How can we ensure that people want to go into the teaching profession, that we keep the best and brightest, and help those who need additional skills to be the best and the brightest?

Think back through your own education. I don't know how many Senators have gone to public schools all their lives. I have, my kids have, and I have been in them. I know. When I look back at my education, or my children's education, and I think about all the teachers I had—think about this: Which one would you pick to get merit pay? It is difficult to do because all of us have had really good teachers. Our kids have had good teachers, and all of us have had good teachers.

I will tell you something. I remember well when my kids were in elementary school and my son had a teacher for whom I didn't particularly care. I was at a meeting with some friends. I complained about the teacher. And, sur-

prisingly, another one of my friends said: You do not like that teacher? That is the best teacher my child has ever had. Why? Because that teacher didn't connect with my son but did connect with her son. Different kids learn different ways. Different kids connect with different adults. A teacher may do really well with one child and not well with another.

Tell me, how are we going to pick which teacher gets the merit pay? By the parents who like the teacher the best? By the teacher who is the toughest, who may do well for some kids but not well for others? By the teacher who does the most testing in their classrooms? By the teacher who passes a test, maybe?

I can tell you this. I have had teachers in my own life and in my kids' lives who were brilliant but who had no way of communicating with the kids they were teaching or how to teach what they held in their own head.

I ask my colleagues, and I ask those who are listening, how would you pick which one of your very own teachers or which one of your kids' teachers should receive merit pay? Do you think you can do a fair job?

That is what we are doing in this amendment we are debating today. Somebody is going to have to pick. Somebody is going to have to choose that curriculum. Instead of encouraging teachers to work together, whatever that criterion is which some principal decides is going to be how they choose a teacher to get merit pay is going to create disincentives in their own building and antagonism in their own building. I don't think that is what we need to be encouraging.

I think we need to address the issue of getting the best and brightest teachers in our classrooms. We do not pay any teacher enough, I am here to tell you, particularly those teachers who are in our toughest schools, who have the kids with 99-percent-free and reduced lunches in their elementary schools. I have been in those schools—kids who come and hear 70 different languages in one school district, kids who come to school who have not even lived in a home, or in the same home for more than several weeks, kids who come to school whose parents may not have come home last night, who may not have eaten last night, who have seen tremendous difficulties in their own lives.

We need to make sure those kids get a good teacher. But those are incredibly difficult challenges, and those are the incredibly difficult classrooms.

If we are going to provide extra pay for a couple of teachers only, I say let's give it to those teachers who are teaching in the most difficult circumstances. We should be giving them combat pay for their difficult circumstances. Certainly, I will tell you that those teachers who are in those

classrooms are not likely to be the ones who get merit pay if it is based on any kind of teacher testing, or testing of their students, because they have the toughest kids in their classrooms.

Merit pay, if you do it on testing, rewards those teachers whose kids come to school ready to learn, whose parents are there helping them, and who come from the communities that have the resources in those schools.

Let's be very careful about what we are promoting. Let's be sure that we tell kids in our high schools and colleges that we want them to teach; we need them to teach. We know we need the best and the brightest in our classrooms, we know we need teachers who are professionals, and we know we must reward them.

I know that doesn't address the question my colleagues brought out about: What about those poor teachers? What about those teachers who aren't qualified?

I can tell you what we are asking teachers to do today is tremendously different from what we asked teachers to do 10, 20, or 30 years ago.

If you got your teaching degree back in 1972 and you are teaching in a classroom today, I assure you that no one in your college taught you how to use a computer. No one taught you how to develop your curriculum to use technology. No one thought you would need the math skills our students need today. No one thought you would be teaching in a classroom with many different languages or cultures. No one thought you would have the discipline problems you have.

Let's take those teachers who got their degree back in 1970, 1975, or 1980 and give them the professional development to get the skills they need in today's classrooms.

I have talked to teachers who feel extremely frustrated. They tell me if I were in a private business and the requirements had changed as dramatically as our public schools had in the last 30 years, they would have sent me to professional development.

We lack the resources and haven't provided the resources in our public education system to give our teachers the professional development they need. Let's not condemn them for that now. Let's do what is right and help provide professional development for our teachers in a way that is constructive so we can keep people who want to be in the classroom but have not been able to keep up.

I think we can revise some of the systems of tenure; many districts have done that. I think that is a good way to proceed.

It is pretty darn frustrating to be a teacher today. They listen to the debate on the Senate floor and they hear about all the horrible teachers who cannot pass tests. These are people with college degrees who chose to be in

our classrooms with our young kids. These are people who we should be supporting. We should be supporting them with incentives to be in the teaching profession. We should support them with quality pay. When teachers work for \$23,000 a year and are told they have to go back and pay for a test to stay in this profession, or pay to go back to school, how do they do that? I don't know how they do that. I don't know how a single mom with a couple of kids who is teaching and earning \$23,000 or \$25,000 a year would ever be able to continue to be in our classroom, even if she were in the best classroom, if we required her to go back to school to take tests.

There is one problem with this underlying amendment I have not mentioned, and I don't think anybody has. There is no money here. It requires testing, and there is no money. That money will have to come from somewhere in the districts. The districts will not have the money, and likely they will require the teachers themselves to pay for it. That has been the practice in the past.

I understand the motive behind the slogan. I understand the desire to tell the good teachers in our classrooms that we appreciate the work they are doing. However, I think we should reward all teachers with better salaries. I think we should provide better training for teachers, more professional development for our teachers, give them the skills they need. If we want to come back and say we have done everything for these teachers to give them the best skills and they still don't make the grade, then there is something to say about this underlying amendment. We haven't done that yet. We have left our teachers behind. As a result, we have left our students behind.

In closing, there are tremendously good people in our schools today who are trying their best and working very hard. I think they deserve the most accolades we can give them. We should not be denigrating them.

We do have some excellent ways of rewarding good teachers today. On my staff, I have a woman named Ann Ifekwunigwe, an Albert Einstein Distinguished Educator. She has been with me on my staff as a fellow for the last year and has done an outstanding job. She is actually an elementary schoolteacher from the Los Angeles Unified School District. She is a great example of what we are already doing. Ann worked very hard and received her national board teacher certificate in California. Once you have done that in California, teachers then get a 15-percent salary increase and a \$10,000 bonus.

There are ways under current law to encourage and help pave the way for teachers who want to get additional training which benefits all of our students. We should encourage those. I

don't think we should be just using a slogan of merit pay, saying we will pick a couple of teachers out of our schools and tell them they are better than the rest of the teachers, without understanding the consequences of what may happen.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington has asked the wrong question. She is looking for examples as to where merit pay is being used successfully and she just cited California. I am not familiar with that program, but it is a certification that led to a bonus and merit pay.

I remind the Senator of the remarks of the Senator from Florida. In Denver, CO, teachers earn additional bonuses if they show student improvement. Secretary Riley, of this administration, previously endorsed merit pay when he served as Governor of South Carolina. Florida law provides bonuses to teachers who are nationally certified by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and can earn additional bonuses if they mentor another teacher in getting nationally certified as an additional bonus.

The superintendent of education from the State of Arizona was recently in our Capitol and lauded the concept of merit pay for teachers who have outstanding capabilities, pointing out this concept is important in order to retain people who are getting better and better. You need to be able to reward that teacher and keep that teacher in the system; otherwise, the individual is likely to leave.

Let me simply say I am quite taken with the argument given by the Senator from Washington which, in theory, runs against everything we do in this country—that there should be no reward for achievement; everybody has to be treated identically or they won't be able to work together.

That message is taught from elementary to high school to college to professional sports, where everybody has to work as a team—but is everybody treated the same way? What corporation in America could function that way? You would pay the salesman who sold 2 vacuum cleaners the same salary as one who sold 10. The American way is one of honest, fair competition and reward. We do not have a system where everybody is dumbed down. Yet this is an argument that people won't be able to get along if one is more successful than the other. The way it has always worked in this country is that person was a role model that made everybody else try to reach that standard to be as successful, to do as well.

Competition makes better products, better performers. The competition of ideas in our democracy makes ideas truer and more honest. Competition is healthy, not detrimental. The whole country is built on the back of it.

I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Florida. I think he is probably somewhat stunned someone remembered something that was said months ago, but it was such a compelling story about the role of teachers in education, and he has been kind enough to stay.

As part of my remarks, I ask the Senator if he might relate to those in the center of this debate that great story of what he found in a very special school when he went to Los Angeles.

Mr. MACK. I thank the Senator for the opportunity to do this. A number of years ago, my wife and I visited a school called the Marcus Garvey School in Los Angeles. I went there because I was trying to learn more about the different types of schools in America—what works, what does not work. While I am going to be talking about the Marcus Garvey School, I am not endorsing or embracing everything the school does. But the thing that stood out to me was the role of the teacher in this school. So this is what happened.

I went to the Marcus Garvey School and met the administrator, the principal, the owner of the school—all one person, Anyim Palmer, who was in a room probably no bigger than 10 by 10, filled with furniture that was probably 35 or 40 years old. The phone was on a stack of papers. There was no secretary. When the phone rang, he answered it. The point I am making is there were not a lot of amenities. This is basic stuff. This is a building with rooms in it, an administrator, teachers, and students.

He said: I want to take you down and show you what some of our students are doing. Unfortunately, the school is not filled today because of the time of the year it is.

Priscilla and I went down to a room where there were three different groups of children being taught in the same room. The first group of students we saw were 2-year-old children. Again, I emphasize 2-year-olds, not second graders; 2-year-old children. There were eight of them sitting at a little table. The teacher said to the children: Show the Senator and Mrs. Mack how you can say your ABCs. You can imagine the cute little voices of those children as they recited their ABCs. When they finished that, the teacher said: Now that you have done it in English, do it in Spanish. So then these little 2-year-old children went through their alphabet in Spanish. When they finished that, the teacher then said to them: Now do the alphabet in Swahili, and they did that as well—2 years old.

We went across the room to where 3-year-old children were doing math problems. The teacher said to me: Give one of the students a math problem. As I would suspect most people would have done, I gave a problem such as 5 plus 8—you know, pretty straightforward. But, again, 3 years old. She

said: No, no, no, give them a tough problem. So I said something like 325 plus 182. And this 3-year-old child, standing at the board, put down little dots, wrote down a number, another series of dots, wrote down a number and got the right answer at 3-years-old.

We went across the room where 4-year-old children were reading. We were told that these children were reading at the second, third, and fourth grade level. They were 4 years old.

We went into another room in this facility where there were 5-year-old children. A little boy was asked to stand up and recite for me, in the proper chronological order, every President of the United States. That little fellow stood up, looked me right in the eyes, and he rattled right through every President of the United States in the proper order. I must admit I knew he did that because they gave me a cheat sheet to look at. He was 5 years old.

Every time we went to a different area and saw these students, these children at work, Priscilla and I would say to this person who was taking us around: How can this be? How can this possibly be? What makes this work? Every single time we asked the question, the answer was: It is the teacher. It is the teacher. It is the teacher.

Anyim Palmer challenged what was then considered the best private school in Los Angeles County, their sixth grade against his third grade students. I think it was in math and English. You know who won—Anyim Palmer's third grade beat the sixth graders. How did he do it? What he said to me was: It was the teacher.

What I found out later is Anyim Palmer was a public school teacher in California who became so frustrated and angry that the system was failing to teach children in his community that he quit the public schools and started his own school. Do you know what he did? He also trained his own teachers. He said: Forget everything you have learned. I am going to train you. I am going to teach you how to teach.

Again, I thank the Senator for asking me to restate that story. It made a major impression on me. We can talk about all these other things, but we must focus on how to make sure that the teacher standing up in front of our children and grandchildren has the knowledge in the subject they are teaching—this is not fancy. We are not asking for special degrees. I am asking a very simple question. If a teacher is standing in front of my little granddaughter, Addison, a few years from now, I want my son and his wife to know the person who is teaching their little daughter has the knowledge in the subject they are teaching. That does not seem to be an unreasonable request to make.

I thank the Senator for asking the question. I yield.

Mr. COVERDELL. I thank the Senator from Florida. He has been at this some time. But let me just ask him, he is a principal coauthor of the measure. Is there anything about this measure that is a mandate?

Mr. MACK. I say to the Senator he is exactly right, there is no mandate. As strongly as I feel about it, I would like to, but I do not think that is our role. I think we can make some serious mistakes by mandating certain things, to say to a particular school district or a particular State they have to do what I say. They might say, what if we put this kind of testing program into effect but our concern is we need more computers. We need more books. We need—whatever.

This is not a mandate. It never has been a mandate. It never will be a mandate, at least as far as the Senator from Michigan and I are concerned. It is merely a statement of importance and it says to the schools if they want to, these dollars can be used for the purpose of developing the concepts for creating tests, developing some merit pay program, or in reforming tenure, all three of which we think can in fact go to the heart of the matter about what is necessary to improve the ability of the teacher.

The inference was made earlier that somehow or another those of us who are talking about this are out to degrade the teachers in this country. That is absolutely a false challenge. Most of us can remember those teachers who made a difference in our lives, who challenged us, who demanded from us that we do better. Each of us responded in a little bit different way. But we understand the importance of having good, quality teachers, and there are a lot of them. That is why we put the merit pay in, to recognize that.

Again, as to this notion that somehow or another if we were to put in place a merit pay system that, highlights teachers who are doing well, and encourages those who are not teaching our children to do better and somehow or another people would know and there would be divisions that would take place, let me tell you something. There is probably not a school in America where every teacher doesn't know who is carrying the load and who is not. You do not need a merit pay program for students and teachers alike to know who the good teachers are. You can just hear the kids talking about it: Boy, I hope I don't get in so-and-so's class.

It doesn't take a merit program. Merit pay is not going to do that. Children and parents already know the good ones and those who are not carrying their load.

What we are trying to do is the right thing.

Mr. COVERDELL. My colleague would agree, would he not, that the merit pay might keep that good teach-

er in that system longer than otherwise? At some point, we know we are losing good teachers because outside interests are seeking that kind of talent.

Mr. MACK. I certainly hope it would do that. I believe it would. As both of us have indicated, the State of Florida has developed a program that provides an incentive for teachers to get certification by a national board. If they receive that certification, they get a bonus.

They also get a bonus if they encourage another teacher to do the same thing.

What we are saying is, we are recognizing, not only through the dollars but through our interest, the importance of that individual teacher and the importance of the quality of that individual teacher. I believe it would encourage them to stay in the system longer. Most of the teachers love the children they are teaching. They want them to do better. We just need to give more encouragement to those teachers.

Mr. COVERDELL. I thank the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Michigan. I see the Senator from Minnesota is prepared to speak. He has been very accommodating. I have a few other things to say, but I am going to yield so he can proceed with his remarks. A little later today, I will have another opportunity, I am sure, to speak again. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague. I reserve my right to the floor and yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

AMENDMENT NO. 3118 TO AMENDMENT 3117

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I send a second-degree amendment to the desk on behalf of myself and the Senator from Washington, Mrs. MURRAY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], for himself and Mrs. MURRAY, proposes an amendment numbered 3118 to amendment No. 3117.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 1 of the amendment in line 4, strike all after "Reforming" through the end of the amendment and insert the following: "and implementing merit schools programs for rewarding all teachers in schools that improve student achievement for all students, including the lowest achieving students;

"(B) Providing incentives and subsidies for helping teachers gain advanced degrees in the academic fields in which the teachers teach;

"(C) Implementing rigorous peer review, evaluation, and recertification programs for teachers; and

"(D) Providing incentives for highly qualified teachers to teach in the neediest schools."

Mr. MACK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

Mr. MACK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota yielded without losing his right to the floor and is entitled to recognition.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I believe I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I already recognized the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, I will first respond, to make this a debate format, to some of the points I heard raised. I also will speak to the second-degree amendment.

One of the points that was made is that the focus on teacher merit is important because it leads to retention of teachers. I want to cite the National Commission on Teaching & America's Future, a report that came out in 1996 in which they spelled out the key elements for effective teacher retention: A, organize professional development around standards for teachers and students; B, provide a yearlong inservice internship; C, include mentoring and strong evaluation of teacher skills; and D, offer stable, high-quality professional development.

The second-degree amendment is about implementing merit schools programs for rewarding all teachers in schools that improve student achievement for all students, including the lowest achieving students.

Over and over, we have been here making sure those students who come from difficult circumstances and do not do as well as the students to whom we pay special attention.

B, providing incentives and subsidies for helping teachers gain advanced degrees in academic fields in which the teachers teach;

C, implementing rigorous peer review, evaluation, and recertification programs for teachers;

And D, providing incentives for highly qualified teachers to teach in the neediest schools.

In many ways, what is in the second-degree amendment mirrors what the National Commission on Teaching & America's Future tells us we need to do to have the very best teachers and retain those teachers as well.

I speak on behalf of the second-degree amendment. I want to talk about where I strongly dissent from the amendment my colleagues from Michigan and Florida have laid out: the emphasis on reforming teacher tenure systems and the emphasis on establishing teacher compensation systems based on merit and proven performance. Then

I will talk about testing teachers periodically in the academic subjects in which they teach. I will talk about each one.

I am the first to admit that the tenure system does not always work the way we want it. I am the first to admit there are some teachers, unfortunately, in our schools who do not add to children but subtract. Sometimes they are tenured teachers, and that is when it gets tough. There is a reason for tenure, and the reason for tenure is to make sure teachers are free to express their ideas.

Albeit, I taught at the college level, but I am a perfect example of someone who benefited from tenure. First, I had to fight to get it. That is a 20-hour speech. The point is, there is no doubt in my mind that tenure was what gave me the protection to freely express my ideas on campus.

When we talk about education, we want students introduced to a variety of ideas, and we do not want teachers put in a position where they do not feel free to express their viewpoint, where they do not feel free to teach the way they believe they should teach, to teach students the way they think they should teach students because they worry about capricious, arbitrary decisions that might be made.

I now will talk about compensation based upon merit and then talk about teachers being tested periodically, and to give the example of Denver, CO, I think, raises yet another question. That has to do with this path we are barreling down with all the emphasis on standardized tests.

It is unbelievable. We have a trend in the country—and thank goodness people are now starting to look at it—where we are going to measure a student's academic performance on the basis of a single standardized test when all the people who have developed those tests tell us we should never use a single standardized test, and when we have not done what we should do to make sure every student has the same opportunity to do well on those tests. Let me do that parallel with teachers.

Let me give an example. I can see how this could very well happen given this proposal. If, for example, how well teachers are doing is based on how well students are doing, which is, in turn, based upon standardized tests given to students at as young an age as 8, if one is teaching in a school in an inner city, if one is teaching in a school in rural America, if one is teaching in a school where these kids come to kindergarten way behind, where they come from poverty homes, where they come from pretty difficult circumstances, and they do not have the resources they need, it could be your students are not going to do as well. Do we then argue the teachers do not show merit?

In addition, what kind of tests are we talking about using? The people who

have done the professional work on having the very best teachers have said that in addition to having the decent salaries, in addition to putting an end to the bashing of public school teachers, in addition to making sure teachers have the resources with which to work, in addition to making sure we invest in the infrastructure of the schools, that we have the technology programs, that we have a manageable class size, in addition to all that, we want to have good peer evaluation, we want to have mentors, we want to have good programs during the summer, such as the Eisenhower program which has been eliminated in this block grant program which enables teachers of math and science to come together to compare notes and become revitalized and renewed. We want to do all of that. None of that is in this proposal. None of it is in the Republican bill, S. 2.

I say to my colleagues, not only does this amendment out here on the floor reflecting S. 2 do precious little to, No. 1, attract the very best into teaching, and, No. 2, to retain the very best in teaching—by the way, we have some of the very best teachers right now in public schools.

You know what, colleagues. Here is my challenge. I will tell you one of the ways we can retain good teachers is to stop bashing public school teachers. Some of the harshest critics of public school teachers on the floor of the Senate could not last 1 hour. I say to Senator SCHUMER, in the classrooms they condemn.

When I go into schools and talk to the students—and I am in a school every 2 weeks—I ask them: What do you think makes for good education? The first thing they say is: Good teachers. That is the first thing, even before, I say to Senator MURRAY, lower class size.

Then I ask: What makes for good teachers? And then we get into this discussion about what makes for good teachers.

By the way, I never hear students say the really good teachers are the teachers who engage in drill teaching, worksheet learning.

They hate it. They say the good teachers are the teachers who fire their imaginations, get them to connect themselves personally to the material they are talking about—none of which is ever reflected in these standardized tests.

Then, later on in the discussion—let's say there is an assembly of 600 students—I ask: How many of you are interested in going into public school teaching? I will tell you, I am lucky if it is 5 percent—maybe it is 10 percent—who say they are. This occurs at the very same time we are talking about over the next 10 years needing 2 million more people to go into education to become teachers, at the very same time we all say we care so much about education.

Then I ask the students: Why not? I want to tell you, colleagues, when these young people talk about whether or not they are going to go into public school teaching, and why they do not want to go into public school teaching, I guarantee you, they never say the reason they are not going to go into public school teaching to become public school teachers is because they are not going to have these merit tests.

They do not say: If there were merit tests, and we would have standardized tests to determine how we are doing to see if we are qualified to teach, then we would be really interested in becoming public school teachers.

They say two things discourage them from becoming public school teachers. No. 1 is that salaries are too low. By the way, a lot of women say—they are very honest about it—there was a time when maybe they would have had to go into teaching. They don't have to any longer in terms of opportunities for them.

The second thing they say—I think this needs to be said to some of our colleagues—is that they would be disrespected. I say to Senator MURRAY, who has probably had this discussion in Washington State, they have put more of an emphasis on being disrespected than the salary. They say there is just very little respect.

Then I say to them: Wait a minute. You are the students. Are you disrespecting your teachers?

They say: Well, you know, on our part, we do not give the teachers the respect they deserve. But it is a problem in the community as well.

So I say to my colleagues on the other side, rather than bringing amendments to the floor of the Senate that do not speak to what it is we should do to attract the very best teachers into public school education, what we should do—some of which is in the second-degree amendment that we now present—is put an emphasis on rewarding schools for doing well with the students and providing subsidies to help teachers gain advanced degrees in academic fields—who could argue with that?—and implementing good peer review. That really matters.

I say to Senator MURRAY, we were both teachers. Senator MURRAY, I think, would agree to having good evaluation and also providing incentives for highly qualified teachers to teach in the neediest schools. I thank my colleagues, Senator KENNEDY and Senator MURRAY, for having that provision in the amendment. That makes a great deal of sense.

The Abraham amendment which basically talks about maybe trying to figure out ways of “reforming” tenure systems, which I think means getting rid of tenure—let's be clear about what we are talking—and then talks about the teacher compensation systems based upon merit and proven perform-

ance, and then right away goes to periodic testing of teachers, is ridiculous. What kind of test are you going to use?

Now we are going to have standardized tests of students all over the country. Now we are going to have a single, standardized test for teachers all over the country. It is all going to become educational deadening. It is all going to discourage really talented people from wanting to teach. It is going to lead to drill education. It is going to focus attention away from what we all should be doing to make sure kids do well in school. It does not represent a step forward.

So I say to colleagues, I come here as someone who views education as the most important issue—that has been my adult life, education—to speak strongly in support of our second-degree amendment and to speak strongly in opposition to the Abraham-Mack amendment.

One final time I have to say this. I want to issue a warning. Albeit, the language is “may,” but there is Federal money involved here. I want to, one more time, say that we are, in the name of “reform,” talking about standardized testing everywhere.

I tell you, we should just listen to the students. I ask every Senator—Democrat and Republican alike—over the next 6 months, to try to spend a good deal of time in the schools in your States. Maybe many of you do. I am not implying the Senator from Michigan does not.

I find very little interest in standardized tests as representing a real indication of reform. I find the interest is in the discussion of smaller class size, the discussion of how to get really good teachers, the discussion of really good child care, prekindergarten, and the discussion of the decaying physical infrastructure of schools. I find a lot of the discussion, frankly, about what happens to kids when they go home and what happens to kids before they go to school. I find a lot of the discussion, in the best schools, about how teachers feel free to teach. They team teach. I heard Senator MURRAY talk about that. It is really very exciting. I would say that is the direction in which we should go, not in this other direction.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak because I believe the right participation by the U.S. Government in the educational process of our children is fundamental to our success as a nation in the next century. It is important for us to understand that we have a limited role in this area.

Mr. President, 93 percent of all the funding for education—93 percent; that is basically \$13 out of \$14 spent in education—comes from State and local

governments. Frankly, I think that is a positive, not a negative. I think when people invest their own resources, when they invest the resources they have control over, they are likely to do so very effectively.

But it is appropriate, and as a matter of fact beneficial, when the Federal Government decides to be of assistance in the area of education. When we are involved, I think there ought to be some principles that we should follow in order to make sure we maximize the positive impact we can have in terms of the achievement standing of children. I use a term such as “achievement standing” or the “capacity to achieve” because I think that is what we are interested in, in education.

The question is, What do we want out of education? I think we want children whose capacity to do things, whose capacity to learn, and the things that they have learned, have been enhanced substantially.

It is nice to have school buildings. It is nice to have teachers. It is nice to have education programs. But ultimately, the purpose for which we develop resources and to which we devote the resources, is to elevate the capacity of children to learn.

How do we improve what happens to children?

I have had some opportunity to be aggressive and active in this area at the State and local level in government. Having spent 8 years as the Governor of my State, and visiting many of Missouri's 550 or so school districts, I know it is the focal point of the community in almost every setting. It is the objective of that community to elevate the standing of students, asking how do we help students do more?

Different communities have found different ways of inspiring students, preparing students, building students, and elevating what happens in the classroom. I think that is what we should be involved in.

During my time as Governor of the State of Missouri, the State board of education was so convinced about getting parents and teachers involved in the education of children, because it motivates children to be achievers, that we had a slogan that said: “Success in school is homemade.”

Talking about localizing what we do in education, if you take it all the way to the home, you have localized it about as much as possible.

As a matter of fact, during my time as the president, or chairman—I forget the designation I carried—for the Education Commission of the States, it was an emphasis we agreed upon nationally that energizing parents and energizing the local community was the way in which we get the most return for our school dollars, as study after study has shown. And the anecdotal evidence is incredibly strong that cultures that involve parents and local

officials in making decisions for what can and will work are the cultures where education succeeds.

So the ingredients of public school success include the very important point of getting students motivated as a result of the active participation of their families.

The House Committee on Education and the Workforce Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations answered this question about what are the ingredients of educational success in a report released in July of 1998. The report was called "Education at a Crossroads: What Works and What's Wasted in Education Today." The subcommittee found that successful schools and school systems were not the product of Federal funding and directives but instead were characterized by—here are the ingredients—parental involvement in the education of their children; two, local control; three, emphasis on basic academics; four, dollars spent in the classroom, not on distant bureaucracy and ineffective programs.

I believe these are the ingredients that are necessary for all of us to understand if we are going to talk about elevating the performance of students, which is why we speak about this issue today, because there are noble objectives and there are programs that may sound novel and noble, but if they don't elevate the status of students, we will have failed miserably.

I am concerned that too often the Federal program which finds its first consumption of resources in the administration of the program and the bureaucracy at the Federal level very frequently then goes to the State bureaucracy at the State level, but it doesn't get all the way to the student.

But there is more to my concern that the proposal just doesn't get all the way to the student. Frequently, when it gets all the way to the student, it directs an activity or a devotion of the resource which is not called for in the circumstance of the student.

So there are two principles that are operative here: First, that we get the resource all the way to the student so that the resource is spent in the classroom and not in the bureaucracy. The second principle is, let the resource be spent, once it is at the level of the student, on things that make a difference in terms of performance and student achievement in the classroom.

It would be appropriate, I think, to have some sense of satisfaction of getting a resource all the way to the classroom and not having the shrinkage of the bureaucracy that takes the resource away. But if the resource gets to the classroom and the expenditure can only be for things that aren't needed or directly pertinent to student achievement, we will have lost the battle anyhow.

Yesterday, I had the opportunity of addressing this body, and I had the un-

happy task of detailing the fact that for tens of thousands of individuals at the State level in our educational effort their entire existence is consumed with filling out Federal forms; that we are serving the bureaucracy with paperwork perhaps more effectively than we are serving the students with education.

If the active participation by parents, community leaders, teachers, and boards of education at the local level is what really energizes schools to elevate the level of student achievement, maybe we should not have so much direction from the Federal level about how much and where the money should be spent.

I think that is pretty clear as a part of this bill which has been offered by our side; that we want to get the resources to individuals in the classroom, and not only deliver the resources to the classroom but to make sure that the best use for those resources can be determined by those who know the names of the students and the needs of the school rather than some hypothetical best use being developed a thousand miles away by bureaucrats who know, in theory, that generally the country needs X or Y but do not have very much awareness of specific needs in specific classrooms, in specific districts, in particular towns, counties, or communities all across America.

So this principle is, one, to get resources to the classroom and, two, to let the people who know the names of the students and the needs of the schools make the decisions. That is of fundamental importance.

When you gather at the Federal level the character of the programs and say we will make all the decisions about what is done, and we may want to get the resources to you but we will tell you what you have to do, that is the equivalent of hanging a sign on the schoolhouse door: "Parents need not apply." It is the equivalent of saying to them, as much as we think you are an important part of education, you won't get to help make a decision about the way the resources are devoted, about the kind of program that is conducted, because, as a matter of fact, we will make those decisions for you in some remote bureaucracy.

I think the key to what we want to do is to empower those individuals at the local level by, first, sharing the resources with them as efficiently as possible, not shrinking it by running it through bureaucracy after bureaucracy and, second, empowering them by saying, once you have the resources, you have the right and opportunity to spend it in ways you know will benefit the students in a specific setting.

We have watched as we have lived with the sort of status quo in education, with the Federal Government trying to impose its ideas on the country, and we aren't showing the desired

results. When you are not getting the right results, if you keep doing the same things, you are asking for difficulty. The industrialist puts it this way: Your system is perfectly designed to give you what you are getting.

If we like what we are getting in education, we should just keep doing what we are doing. But if we think we can do better—as a matter of fact, if we think we must do better for the next generation of Americans, if we recognize that the world is exploding in a technological, developmental sense, and that for people to be at the top of the list, they are going to have to be able to deal with technology and they will have to have high levels of achievement and capacity in terms of education, I think we are going to have to confess that we must do better. And in order to do better, we have to change what we are doing.

It is virtually impossible to do better if we just do the same thing over and over. I think State and local governments need the kind of flexibility that we provide, and I think when we try to restrict that flexibility, when we try to restrain the capacity of the people who know best what their own children need, who witness what will motivate, on occasion, success in those students, we tell them they can't use that judgment, awareness, and knowledge, they can't use their proximity to the problem as a basis for developing a solution, as a matter of fact, we are hindering the process.

I stand to speak in favor of this measure which will not only move resources to the local and State level but will provide the authority and flexibility so those resources can be devoted to students in classrooms in ways that are known by the individuals who know—teachers and students—and to the needs of the institution to improve performance. I believe that is the key.

For us to persist in doing what we have done with the status quo, to persist with a system that finds more and more people disenchanted because they find their hands tied, and they want to do one thing they believe will help their students but the government says, no, they have to do something else, which isn't that helpful, or, even in order to do something else, they have to file a stack of papers that will take people out of the classroom, moves people away from education.

For the Federal Government, according to a study in Florida, to administer Federal dollars, it is about six times as expensive as it is to administer a State dollar. That is six times the paperwork volume that is basically involved.

We ought to begin to wonder whether those individuals who actually have the stake in the circumstances, their child in the school, why we should distrust them and impose this sort of not only rigid set of requirements but this rigid audit trail which requires six

times as much administration as a State or local dollar does to deliver educational capacity to children. That is something we ought to be leery of. We ought to say, wait a second. Why would we want to spend all of that money in administration and second-guessing those who know best about their own children, their own future, and who have a stake in this issue, which is the important stake, and that is the achievement of the students?

I think we ought to ask ourselves what happens in education when there is more nonteachers in the education system than there is teachers in the education system? When the administration of education and the tens of thousands of full-time equivalents across the country mandated by the Federal Government consume the resources instead of the resources getting to the classroom, we ought to ask ourselves: Is this the way for us to really be achievers?

We know when people have the right opportunity to succeed and the right resources, they can get the job done—my colleagues and I have talked about it over and over again—when they have the right opportunity in terms of resources and the right authority in terms of flexibility.

I think those are the two keys we have offered to the American people by this measure on our side as a way of allowing them to use the money they have paid in taxes to elevate the capacity of the students who will chart the course of America in the next century.

We want for our children high levels of achievement. The children are the focus. The classroom is the focus. It is the place where it happens to those on whom we focus—the children. The ingredients of success are not great bureaucracies. They are great teachers, great classrooms, and great students. And it involves parents. When we tell parents the bureaucracy will make the decisions, we shunt them aside. We tell them they need not apply. That is a dangerous strategy and damaging to our students.

Our Federal programs haven't worked, and just doing more of it won't improve our performance.

My grandfather's admonition was, "I sawed this board off more times, and it is still too short." If you keep sawing it will still be too short. You have to change your conduct.

We should change the focus at the local level; States and local governments need the ability as it relates to teachers. As Senator ABRAHAM said, we are not going to mandate that the States and local communities deal with teachers in any specific way. We want to authorize them to be able—with the resources they earned and paid in taxes—to devote those resources in such a way that they believe it will result in elevated performance for the students.

That is the long and the short of what we ought to be doing. The status quo is unacceptable. America will not survive on a continuing basis in the long term with our students being last on the list of those among industrialized nations. It doesn't matter if we are first on the list of expenditures. It doesn't matter if we have more resources devoted to the process that is eventually sucked into the bureaucracy or devoted to things that do not pay off. What matters is that students achieve. We cannot long endure as the leader of the free world if our students are the last on the list. Being the leader and being last doesn't fit.

It is time for us to focus our energies, resources, and authority to make good decisions for the elevation of student capacity. That will make a difference at the local level. That is why this measure is such an important measure.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in order to try to inform the membership, we are attempting to establish a time situation so Members will know. We wanted to have a very brief comment on this second degree to the underlying amendment, and then to move ahead with an announcement which will be agreed to by leaders that would spell out how we would proceed from that time. That is in the process of being worked out, as I understand it. But we are reasonably hopeful that in a very short period of time we will either have a vote on this, or perhaps we could set it aside and start considering other amendments. We are prepared to do it. I will see what the mood is after I address the Senate for just a few minutes at this time.

Mr. President, I will speak briefly about the second-degree amendment that Senator MURRAY and I have offered. I think there has been a good debate and discussion about the importance of well-trained teachers, continuing and ongoing professional development, and also incentives for teachers who want to try to have a continued academic degree and who go through various certification processes.

Our amendment, as Senator WELLSTONE pointed out, seeks to do the merit program on a whole school level that rewards all teachers in the schools; improve achievement for all students, including the lowest achieving students; provide incentives and subsidies for helping teachers with advanced degrees; and implements a rigorous peer review evaluation recertification that takes in many considerations during the course of a year. It is a very rigorous program where teachers are evaluated by master teachers, where there is a video sample of their work evaluated. We believe that is consistent with other provisions of the Democratic alternative.

We are saying to the parents of this country that we are including in our educational program, recommendations that work—that have been tried and tested.

We differ with our Republican friends who say let's have a blank check and send it to the State capitals. Let's have block grants and let the Governors make the decisions and judgments about what they are going to do.

We differ with that. That is why we offered this second-degree amendment.

You could say: What is your evidence in terms of these particulars schoolwide? I want to correct the Record of my good friend from Georgia who said Secretary Riley tried merit pay in North Carolina. It is true. He did try it. It is also true he also decided that it failed after the State spent \$100 million. They changed their program to the merit schools program, which is working, which is exactly what we are doing today. You now have probably the most successful school district in the country, which is in North Carolina, which is using just the kind of program that we are talking about. We are seeing the development of the same kind of program in the State of Kentucky.

In North Carolina, the State focuses on whole school achievement and overall student achievement for reward. The State doesn't believe that individual activities can be isolated to determine what produced the improvements in student achievement—it's a whole school effort. Therefore, the focus is rewarding the whole school. Rewards are given to the school, and all teachers and the principal benefit.

If any State wants to use their 93 cents out of any dollar for the objectives that the Senator from Michigan points out, they are free to do so. We don't prohibit it. If they want to do it, they can do it. We are saying with our 7 cents of the money that is going out in the local community, we are going to support tried and tested programs that have been successful.

I asked earlier in the day what States permit individual merit pay, and we still do not have an answer. What we know on our side, for example, is supported by a CRS Report dated June 3, 1999, "Performance-Based Pay for Teachers." It states that many individual merit-pay plans were adopted as a means to increase teacher accountability and improve classroom performance. But, these plans not only failed to improve student achievement, but also destroyed teachers' collaboration with each other and teachers' trust in the administrators.

Instead, the more recent shift toward group-based, whole school incentive pay plans, allows teachers to focus on fostering overall student learning. These plans encourage teachers to work together within a school in a non-competitive environment.

We support States that have merit pay with regard to whole school programs, merit pay for enhanced academic accomplishment, merit pay for evaluations and the recertifications. All of those are very worthy and are permitted and encouraged in our amendment.

We listened earlier about an excellent school in New Haven, CA, one of the poorer districts in California. Classroom teachers, while still working with children, have opportunities to have their knowledge and skills rewarded both financially and by returning something to the profession.

In New Haven, classroom teachers carry out internship programs, develop curriculum, design technological supports, and create student standards, assessments, and indicators of student learning.

Using a combination of release time, afterschool workshops, and extensive summer institutes, the district involved more than 100 teachers—nearly two-fifths of K through 4—on the language arts and math standards committee during 1996–1997 year.

During the summer of 1997, nearly 500 teachers, approximately 65 percent of the certified teachers, participated in district-sponsored staff development activities. The district had 24 different workshops in technology alone, offering a wide variety of different areas, including math and science instruction, bilingual programs, and many others.

The district pays the teachers for the courses leading to the additional certification in the hard-to-staff areas, such as special education, math, science, and bilingual. If the district does not pay the teachers for their time directly, the work counts toward increments on their salary scale.

The district provides free courses that reap ongoing financial benefits for teachers.

The district is bringing the salary incentives for those who have successfully passed the National Board for Professional Training Standards. The NBPTS for teachers was instituted in 1987. Achieving the national board certification involves completing a year-long portfolio that illustrates teacher practices through the lesson plan, with samples of student work over time and analyses of teaching.

They found that this school district—one of the poorest and neediest in all of California, the New Haven Unified School District, in a low-wealth district—now has an excellent reputation in education. Twenty years ago, it was one of the poorest in education, as well as financially. Today, they have closed their doors to out-of-district transfers and moved up into one of the highest achieving schools in California.

This is how it was done with regard to the teachers. There are other elements necessary in terms of classrooms.

Finally, I mention in Charlotte, NC, Mecklenburg, they ran an annual achievement goals-bonus cycle. This is how they consider their school district. Based on the degree to which the schools attained a set of goals, including improvement in academic performance, advanced course enrollment, dropout rates, and student attendance, there were two levels of bonus awards—100 percent and 75 percent. Schools that earned 75 to 100 percent of the possible goal points were designated exemplary, and bonuses of \$1,000 and \$400 were awarded to teachers and classified staff. Schools earning 60 to 74 percent of the possible goal points were designated as outstanding, and the bonus amounts were \$700 and \$300 for teachers and staff, respectively.

We are for it. But we ought to do it in ways that work. That is what our amendment does. That is why it deserves to be accepted by this body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I rise to commend my friend from Michigan for his amendment. I endorse the amendment. I think it is only common sense that we deal with this issue. I will make some comments about the underlying bill and what I have heard in this debate and try to put it in some kind of context.

First let me outline what credentials I have to comment on this. About a dozen years ago, I was approached by the chair of the Utah State School Board and asked to chair the Strategic Planning Commission that was being followed by that school board to create a strategic plan for Utah schools.

Frankly, that was the experience that got me back into public life. I was very comfortably ensconced as CEO of a profitable company and thinking that would be my career for the rest of my life. Getting involved in educational issues, becoming chairman of that planning commission, and laying out a strategic vision for Utah schools got me immersed in the whole education issue.

What I discovered 12 years ago—a depressing thing, by the way, and nothing has changed in the intervening 12 years—was that the school system was focusing on the wrong issue. Indeed, we named our report “A shift in focus” because we said that was what was going to be necessary to solve the educational problem in this country.

All of the focus of the professional educators and people involved in education was on the system: How can we tweak, fine-tune, fund, change, somehow manipulate the system?

As we got into it, we said no, the shift should be from focusing on the system and how it works, to focusing on the student and what he needs.

I offered this analogy going back again to my business roots. In the automobile world, at one time General

Motors focused entirely on the way they made automobiles. They said: These are the automobiles we make. Now, sales department, you go out and sell the automobiles to the public.

Toyota came along, a very small company, and said: We are going to ask the drivers what they want in a car, and we are going to focus on drivers rather than cars. As a result, Toyota came up with an entirely different kind of car from those General Motors was producing. The focus was on the driver and not the car. The focus was on the customer and not the company. The company that focused on the customer and on the driver did exceedingly well. Toyota grew from a tiny company to the second largest in the world making automobiles and became, for a time, more profitable than General Motors, until General Motors discovered they had to shift their focus.

Instead of saying, this is what we produce, you go buy it; like Toyota, they started asking the question: What do you want? We will go make it. Saturn, a General Motors venture, came out entirely of that activity.

That is the analogy I used when I wrote that strategic plan for Utah schools: Instead of focusing on the school system and how it works, focus on the students and what they need. We were asked to come up with a mission statement for education as we did that commission. The mission statement we came up with terrified the superintendent of schools in the State of Utah. He said: You can't say that because if you say that, we will get sued.

We went ahead and said it anyway. What we said was: The mission of public education is to empower students to function effectively in society. That is what we are here for, to empower students to function effectively in society.

No, no, no, say the professionals; the mission of education is to construct a system that does the following things.

We do not measure the system. We measure the ability of the students to function in society. If they cannot function effectively in society, they are not getting a decent education. That was a radical notion 12 years ago. As I say, 12 years have passed and very little has changed.

Those are my credentials. That is the background I had coming in and listening to this debate. As I listen to this debate, I have some very, for me, interesting reactions.

First, from our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle, we have had an eloquent, continuing, and unrelenting defense of the status quo. Any suggestion that we try to do anything different is met with a stonewall of criticism and fear that somehow something will change. There is an unrelenting defense of the status quo that has been the underlying theme of this entire debate, as far as my friends on the other side of the aisle are concerned.

Interestingly enough, an overwhelming defense of the status quo is not what the American people want to hear. So if we go out on the campaign trail for just a moment, we find the Vice President saying we need revolutionary changes in education. There is an article that ran in this morning's Washington Post, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of my remarks, written by George Will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. BENNETT. He is talking about the Vice President's recent talk on education, and he quotes the Vice President as saying:

Today, I am proposing a new national commitment to bring revolutionary improvements to our schools—built on three basic principles. First, I am proposing a major national investment to bring revolutionary improvements to our schools. Second, I am proposing a national revolution—

And so on. According to Mr. Will, the Vice President used "revolution," "revolutionary," or "revolutionize" 8 times in his speech and "invest," a word we know means spending, 14 times.

As Mr. Will concludes in his article:

The basic Gore position is that the public schools are splendid, and at the same time desperately in need of revolutionary investments.

I find a disconnect between the Vice President's rhetoric out on the campaign trail and what we are hearing on the floor today because any attempt on the part of the Republicans to produce something that is different is attacked. Anything we say let's experiment with is attacked. The overwhelming defense of the status quo is underlying everything our friends on the other side of the aisle are saying.

From the prospect of the position I had as chairman of that strategic planning commission, I want to look at this fearsome, frightening, Republican proposal that would go into such new ground as to somehow threaten the status quo. It is the most timid, it is the most small, tiny, incremental kind of revolution I have ever seen.

The bill the Republicans are putting forward is, to put a number on it, something like 98-percent status quo. It funds the programs we have now, and it funds them generously. It supports the programs we have now, and it supports them solidly. But it says, putting the smallest toe at the very edge of the smallest possible body of water: Couldn't we just try a couple of things? Couldn't we give 10 States the chance, if they want to—no mandates, no requirements—just 10 States the chance, if they might want to, to try something out? In another area, couldn't we just try 15 States? Boy, that is bold and revolutionary and going to upset the whole world—15 States, if they decide

they want to, might be able to try a few things a little differently.

These are the threatening kinds of Republican proposals that are coming along that are causing our friends to be so excited about anything that might in any way upset the status quo. If a State finds the Republican proposal is so revolutionary and threatening that it will destroy the State's ability to deliver education to its children, the State does not have to accept it. There is no mandate in this bill at all that says any State has to do any of the things we are giving them the opportunity to do. This is just the first tiny step. From my position as chairman of that strategic planning commission, I would look at the Republican proposal and say: This is timid. This is not nearly what is needed.

But I come here and discover it is denounced as somehow so threatening that it is going to bring down the entire educational edifice of the United States. But I repeat, at the same time, there is that kind of attack on Republican willingness to innovate and to even allow States to try a few things. At the same time that kind of attack is going on, the Vice President is going up and down the country demanding revolutionary improvement with major investments. I would like to know what those revolutionary improvements are. I would like to know, in the context of this bill, what changes in the status quo in revolutionary fashion the Vice President has in mind. If you get to the details, the only revolution he is calling for is spending more money on programs that already exist.

Let's take a look for just a minute at some past history. I want to read an excerpt from the Washington Post, talking about schools in the District of Columbia. It says:

Alarmed by the crises confronting Washington youth, a group of community leaders is urging sweeping changes in D.C. public schools.

That does not sound like the status quo is so wonderful.

And another:

A new consumer guide to the nation's public school system ranks only two urban school systems lower than the D.C. schools.

Again, the status quo is not so wonderful. The interesting thing about these quotes from the Washington Post is that they appeared there in 1988, 12 years ago. For 12 years, Republicans have been trying to bring about some changes in the D.C. public schools. I have stood on this floor and debated this issue in the context of the D.C. appropriations bill. Every time we try to try something different in D.C., we are told no, we cannot upset the status quo.

Here is another quote from the Washington Post:

The malaise that infects the District of Columbia public schools runs deep. . . . There are problems in every phase of the edu-

cational process. There are school system employees who display no interest in the advancement of students, while excellent teachers and administrators are smothered by confusing and contradictory directives. . . . Instruction is inconsistent. At many schools, the audit said, test results have not been shared with parents and teachers. . . . The teacher appraisal process has been a joke. In the 1988-1989 school year, not one teacher received a conditional or unsatisfactory rating. On average, 22 percent of the teachers received no evaluation at all. While some excellent teaching was observed, the audit said, the predominant classroom activity involved students copying exercises and directions from books while teachers graded papers at their desks.

This appeared in the Washington Post in 1992, some 4 years after the first articles appeared in the Washington Post.

What revolutionary changes are we talking about? Every time the Republicans come to the floor and ask for an incremental change, we are told, no, you are undermining the confidence in public schools.

For over a dozen years now, in at least the Nation's school district where we have some degree of influence, the public school system has failed the children of the public schools.

As I listen to this debate and relive my experiences from memory as being chairman of the Strategic Planning Commission for the Utah State board of education, I realize how timid public policymakers really are, how anxious they are to talk about revolutionary improvements when they are running for office, and how anxious they are to stifle any attempt to bring to pass any sort of revolution when they have the opportunity to make a policy decision.

We must recognize, as I said before, this bill as what it is. The underlying bill is not a revolutionary bold attack on the status quo. I wish it were. There are many things that can and should be done. This is just the most timid kind of probing into possibilities, and yet even that is too much, even that is too fearful for those defenders of the status quo.

I go back to my original analogy. When it was first suggested to General Motors that they might produce some smaller cars, that they might try to go after the market that Toyota was beginning to discover, there was a mantra that ran through General Motors and Ford and the big three generally, and it was: Small cars mean small profits. It was repeated over and over.

By repeating that mantra to themselves, these auto executives convinced themselves that the status quo was just fine, and they watched the Japanese come into this country and take market share away from them to a degree that, to some extent, threatened their existence.

It was only after the marketplace told them they should be focusing on the driver and what the driver wanted

rather than on their own systems and what they were comfortable producing that they finally began to compete in the world marketplace for automobiles and began to produce the kinds of cars Americans wanted to drive.

Now American manufacturers are competitive, and we drive American cars with the understanding that they are well built, they have good fuel economy, and they give us the value for the money, an understanding that, frankly, 15 or 20 years ago, Americans did not have.

Why can't we have that same understanding with respect to education instead of being so overwhelmingly concerned with the system and how do we tweak the system and how do we defend the system and this is the way we teach and, by George, the students have to sit there and take it.

Why can't we say: What do the students need to function effectively in society? Why can't we assess the student needs, the student challenges in the future, and the student responsibilities and then say, OK, if that is what the student needs, we will provide it? If the student needs skill in the English language, to a degree that he or she does not have it now, we better figure out a way to get it to them.

The main problem with our school system is this: Our school system is built on the industrial model. Indeed, it was created as we went through the Industrial Revolution. Stop and think about it for a moment.

Our schools are factories. That is, the model on which they are built is the factory model, with the student as product and the teacher as worker. Indeed, we organize the workers into unions, which is just the same thing that happens in a factory.

Here is the product. The product is wheeled into the English room where the English worker pours English into the product for 45 minutes. The factory whistle blows, and the product is wheeled into the math room, where the math worker pours math into the product for 45 minutes. The factory whistle blows, and the product is wheeled into the social sciences room where the social science worker pours social science into the product for 45 minutes, and so on.

It is organized along the industrial model, student as product, teacher as worker.

After the product has gone through enough class time exposures, we stamp a certificate on it, which we call a diploma, and send the product out into the world saying: You are now educated, and the certificate we have put upon you proves it. We spend more attention to seat time than we do to the ability of the student to perform.

If I may digress for a moment and give you an example of how pervasive this whole mentality is from my own State, I want to talk about one of the

members of our commission. We had a professor in educational psychology at Brigham Young University who was a member of the Strategic Planning Commission, which I chaired. I will not give you all of this history, except to tell you he made a commitment early in his life that he would return some day to the tiny rural community in Utah where he grew up and give something back to that community. It was an emotional kind of commitment made as a teenager when the people in that community raised enough money to send him to the University of Utah to get a college education, something he never could have afforded on his own.

As I say, he is a professor, graduated Ph.D. from Stanford, one of the Nation's leading authorities on small school problems. The position of superintendent of the school district in which his old hometown was located became vacant. He said to his wife: I am going to apply for that position.

She said: Come on, that's so far below what you do and what you are qualified for professionally.

He said: No, I made a commitment years ago that I would someday return to my hometown and give back to that community, and here is a way I can do it. I can go there, be the superintendent of schools, try a whole bunch of innovative things, and make a major difference. I can fulfill that age-old commitment I made as a teenager to go back to my community.

He applied for the position. He was told that he was not qualified for the position because there were certain gaps in his academic record that were required for that particular assignment. All right, he said, I will fill those gaps.

He went around to his colleagues in the School of Education at Brigham Young University and said: Give me the test. I have to have this particular class on my transcript. Even though I am a Ph.D. from Stanford, I have to have this particular class. Give me the test. I will take the test and demonstrate proficiency.

They said: No, no, no, no, no, no. You have to take the class. We can't give you an examination to find out whether you are proficient. You have to take the class.

He said: Some of these classes I teach.

They said: It doesn't matter. You have to sit in the classroom for the prescribed number of hours or we will not certify you as being educated.

He did not become the superintendent of schools in that particular rural district. This demonstrates the commitment that runs through the entire educational community, to seat time as the ultimate measure of educational ability.

What we are saying in this bill is, let's take a tiny, incremental, very

tentative step towards looking at the needs of the student instead of focusing on the structure of the system, toward saying if somebody teaches a class, let's just assume that he knows what is in that curriculum and does not have to sit through it in order to acquire the requirements of the system.

Let's move from the industrial model paradigm that has the student as product and teacher as worker to a system with the student as worker—student, you are responsible for your own education—and teacher as coach. Teacher, help the worker understand where to go to get this information, to look for that skill, and so on.

In the process that means, ultimately, we will have a system that funds the student rather than the system. We will have a funding system where the money follows the student wherever the student, as worker, decides he or she needs to go, with the teacher, as coach, saying: You may have made a wrong decision. Look at the options. Look what you could do over there. Let me help you. Let me coach you. Let me support you. But understand, the ultimate responsibility for your education is yours, not mine.

That kind of a paradigm shift in thinking throughout the entire educational system would be truly a revolutionary improvement rather than the kind of changes or improvements that the Vice President has in mind when he uses those phrases.

I thank the Chair and the other Members of the Senate for your indulgence. As I have gone on this trip down memory lane of my own involvement with schools, I close with this one last anecdote.

When we were laying out, for an employee of the Utah board of education, some of the things we wanted to do and wanted to see happen in Utah's schools, he looked at me with great horror and said: We can't do that overnight. He said: Understand, we are trying to make these sorts of improvements. We are trying to make this a better situation for kids. But we can't do it overnight. You are too impatient. You come out of the business world where you can make a decision and then have it implemented. We can't do that. He said: But give us credit for moving. We will move in this direction, but we won't get there for 15 years.

I said to him: Now, wait a minute. Fifteen years?

Think of that in terms of the life of the student. That means the students who are entering this system as kindergartners, this year, will not see any improvement in their entire career because they will graduate before 15 years as seniors from high school.

If you think it is salutary that we can get changes moving slowly, and they will be effective in 15 years, you are just saying that a kindergartner entering school today is doomed to

stay in the status quo his or her entire career through elementary and secondary education.

As the quotes I have read indicate, I was right. Students who entered as kindergartners, at least in the District of Columbia, are now graduating as seniors with no improvements, no changes. That is tragic.

To condemn a youngster as a kindergartner to no changes, no improvements, no experimentation at all, just to defend the status quo, and say, we are moving towards these changes, and they will come 15 or 20 years from now, is not something with which I want to be associated.

The Republican bill is not threatening. The Republican bill is not revolutionary. The Republican bill is the tiniest kind of incremental opportunity for States to experiment. We ought to pass it.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

A LESSON PLAN FOR GORE

(George F. Will)

If AL GORE keeps talking incessantly about education, someday he may slip and say something interesting. But he avoided that pitfall—anything novel would offend his leash-holders, the teachers' unions—in his Dallas speech last Friday, unless you find interesting this unintended lesson, drawn from his speech, about how schools are failing to teach future speech-writers how to write:

"Today, I am proposing a new national commitment to bring revolutionary improvements to our schools—built on three basic principles. First, I am proposing a major national investment to bring revolutionary improvements to our schools. Second, I am proposing a national revolution in . . ."

By November the salient issue may be not education but: Can Americans bear a president who talks to them as though they are dim fourth-graders? Whoever writes GORE's stuff knows his style, the bludgeoning repetition of cant, as in his almost comic incantations about Republicans' "risky tax schemes." In Dallas, GORE used "revolution," "revolutionary" or "revolutionize" eight times and "invest" (a weasel word to avoid "spending") or some permutation of it 14 times. And—it is as reflexive as a sneeze—he used "tax scheme" three times, "risky tax cut" once and threw in another "scheme," referring to vouchers, for good measure.

GORE's grating style in Dallas suited his banal substance, which was Lyndon Johnson redux. The crux of GORE's plan is more spending of the kinds that are pleasing to teachers' unions. Such as: "My education plan invests in smaller schools and smaller classes—because we know that is one of the most effective ways to improve student performance."

Actually, we know no such thing. Pupil-teacher ratios have been shrinking for a century. In 1955 pupil-teacher ratios in public elementary and secondary schools were 30.2-to-one and 20.9-to-one respectively. In 1998 they were 18.9-to-one and 14.7-to-one. We now know it is possible to have, simultaneously, declining pupil-teacher ratios and declining scores on tests measuring schools' cognitive results. If making classes smaller is such an effective route to educational improvement,

why, after 45 years of declining pupil-teacher ratios, are schools so unsatisfactory they need to be "revolutionized" by GORE's "investments"?

GORE's Dallas speech proves the need for remedial classes not only in prose composition but in elementary arithmetic, too. He says that George W. Bush's "tax scheme, if enacted, would guarantee big cuts in spending for public schools." Well.

Bush's proposed tax cut over 10 years would involve just 5 percent of projected federal revenues. And federal money amounts to just 7 percent of all spending on public elementary and secondary education. Tonight's homework assignment, boys and girls, is to calculate how trimming 5 percent of federal revenues could necessitate "big cuts" in education, 93 percent of which is paid for with nonfederal funds.

GORE's vow that every new teacher hired under his program would be "fully qualified" probably is an encoded promise that all new teachers would be herded through the often petty, irrelevant and ideologically poisoning education schools that issue credentials to teachers. Education schools feed their graduates into, and feed off, the teachers' unions. Those unions sometimes push for state legislation that keeps the education schools in business by requiring teachers to pass through them.

"There are," says GORE, "too many school districts in America where less than half the students graduate, and where those who do graduate aren't ready for college or good jobs." Washington has lots of public schools that fit that description, which is why none of GORE's children attended one.

Most failing schools serve (if that is the word) poor and minority children, whose parents increasingly favor meaningful school choice programs—programs that give parents resources to choose between public and private schools, thereby making the public school system compete. GORE is vehemently opposed to that. The "dramatic expansion of public school choice" he promises would enable students to choose only among public schools, thereby keeping students from low-income families confined to the public education plantation.

What would be "revolutionary" would be a GORE education proposal that seriously offended the teachers' unions. But he is utterly orthodox in his belief that public schools are splendid—and desperately in need of revolutionizing investments.

"Fundamental decisions about education have to be made at the local level," said GORE at the beginning of last week's litany of proposals for using federal money, and the threat of withdrawing it, to turn the federal government into the nation's school board. To the classes GORE needs in remedial composition and arithmetic, add one on elementary logic.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, to alert the membership of what we are trying to do, we have been in touch, of course, with the majority. We would like to finish the pending amendments the Abraham and Kennedy amendments, in the near future. Then what is anticipated by the leadership, as I understand it, is to go to the Murray amendment.

Senator MURRAY has graciously agreed to the time agreement of an

hour and a half, evenly divided. Then we would go to the LIEBERMAN amendment. I have spoken to Senator Lieberman. He agrees to 2 hours on his side, and the majority could take whatever time they believe appropriate on that amendment. Then we would go to the Gregg amendment.

The only thing we are waiting on is a copy of the Gregg amendment. We have not seen that. As soon as that is done, with the concurrence of the majority—which we have kept advised during the entire morning—we would be able to enter into an agreement. It is up to the majority leader, of course, as to when the votes would take place.

I see the majority leader on the floor. What we would like to do, prior to an agreement—we have had Senators waiting here most of the morning. They would like to speak. Senator DORGAN would like a half hour; the two Senators from New York would use 10 minutes of Senator DORGAN's time to speak about the death of Cardinal O'Connor. Senator FEINGOLD wants 12 minutes to speak on some matter. I really don't know what that is.

I did not know the majority leader was on the floor. I was just trying to alert everyone as to what we are trying to do.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if the Senator would yield, I did not hear all of what he said. I was back in the Cloakroom preparing to come to the floor.

Mr. REID. If the Senator would yield, what we would like to do when we finish this, which should be momentarily—either having a vote now or setting it aside—is to go to the other amendments after Abraham, Kennedy. Senator MURRAY, who has the next amendment in order on our side, will agree to an hour and a half on her class size amendment. Following that would be Senator LIEBERMAN. There has been agreement his would be the next amendment. He has agreed to 2 hours on his side on that. He indicated he did not know if the majority would need that much time. But whatever the majority wants, that would be the case.

Then it is my understanding we would go to the Gregg amendment, with no time agreement as far as we are concerned. We have not seen the Gregg amendment. We have been waiting for some time now. It is on its way. But the route sometimes is circuitous to get here. I did indicate, I think we have some Members who have been wanting to speak all morning.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if Senator REID would yield, I understand that you are waiting to see the Gregg amendment. Of course, we would like to see the Lieberman alternative also.

Do we have that?

Mr. REID. Yes. It is my understanding that Senator LIEBERMAN has been in touch with members of the majority for the last several days.

Mr. LOTT. But I do not know that we have seen the language. That is what I

have to make sure of, just like you need to see—

Mr. REID. I think you have. But if you haven't, that is certainly available.

Mr. LOTT. Of course, as far as the timing, we have Senators that are very interested in speaking on the pending matter, in addition to the ones you have mentioned.

I must confess, I was a little surprised that there was a second-degree amendment offered to Abraham-Mack. I thought when we entered that earlier agreement we would have the four that were agreed to. While there was language in there that said that, I guess, relevant second degrees would be in order—or perfecting amendments—I had the impression we were kind of not going to do that.

So the fact that there is now an amendment to the Abraham-Mack amendment I think puts a different spin on things. Our people need to be able to review that and speak on the second-degree amendment.

In addition, I see Senator ABRAHAM, who is the sponsor of the underlying amendment. Basically, what I am saying is, I think it is going to take more time than we had earlier thought that it might take. And then we would want to look at, are we going to have a second-degree amendment or second-degree amendments on the Murray amendment? That would certainly change the mix once again.

We need to make sure we have enough time on both sides for people to speak on Lieberman and Gregg once we have seen those. Everybody is working in good faith, and it is a little complicated. We could have objections on either side about what might be offered as second-degree amendments. We have some people on both sides who are now saying they want to offer noneducation, nonrelevant amendments, and we have been trying to stay on the education issue. It has been a very healthy debate, and everybody has stayed in close touch. We would like to continue that.

I have to work with some people on our side who want to offer some amendments sort of out of line. I think people not even on the committee who want to offer amendments at this point would be pushing the envelope. We ought to at least give the chairman and ranking member and people with education amendments a chance to make their pitch.

So rather than take up a lot of time, I would like to talk with the Senator from Nevada about the amendments and the time that might be needed. We will try to get something worked out and come to the floor soon to get something agreed to. In the meantime, continue with the debate and we won't be losing time—valuable time, as a matter of fact.

Mr. REID. If the leader will yield, the purpose of this was to try to move a

number of amendments along. From what the leader has said, it is going to be very difficult today to go beyond the Murray amendment. We will certainly try to cooperate, but it may be difficult.

Mr. LOTT. It may be difficult, but we can see what might be able to be done.

Mr. REID. The one thing I would like to do is make sure that the—we have had Senators over here waiting literally all morning to speak for a short period of time. I know Senator ABRAHAM wants to speak on his amendment and that of Senator KENNEDY. I would like to propound a unanimous consent agreement that Senator DORGAN be recognized for a half hour, that 10 minutes of that time be allotted to Senators SCHUMER and MOYNIHAN to speak about the death of the New York Cardinal, and that Senator FEINGOLD be allowed to speak for 12 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. I would like to ask the majority leader if he would yield for a question.

Mr. LOTT. Yes.

Mr. DURBIN. I am relatively new to the Senate. The House rule used to say committee members could offer only germane amendments. Do I understand the majority leader is suggesting that as a standard in the Senate?

Mr. LOTT. No, I didn't suggest that. I am saying that members of the committee have education amendments and would like to have them offered. We have some members on both sides of the aisle now who are saying, "I want my amendment to be next," and I am not inclined to be impressed with that suggestion. We need to go forward with the way we have been trying to proceed and get our work done. But, no; the way it works around here is, if you can horn your way into a debate that is underway, then that is the way it is.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, how about my request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LOTT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, just to facilitate the flow here, let me make sure we have some sort of a sharing of time, alternating back and forth. The Senator's proposal was 30 minutes for Senator DURBIN, 10 minutes for Senators SCHUMER and MOYNIHAN, and 12 minutes for Senator FEINGOLD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator repeat the unanimous consent request.

Mr. REID. What I proposed is that Senator DORGAN be recognized for 30 minutes, with 10 minutes of his time being allotted to the Senators from New York, and that 12 minutes be allotted to Senator FEINGOLD. They have been here literally all morning.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately fol-

lowing the block of time for those speakers, an equal amount of time be allocated to Senator ABRAHAM and to myself, or my designee. I know the Senators from New York are going to talk about the Cardinal's death.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LOTT. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I would like to speak after Senator ABRAHAM.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I amend my request that Senator ABRAHAM be recognized first, and then Senator SESSIONS, and any remaining time will be used by myself or my designee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ABRAHAM. Reserving the right to object, although I would like to speak on the amendment, as well as the second degree, because of a ceremony taking place in the Capitol rotunda now, of which I am to be a part, I may not be in a position to immediately follow the final speaker. I suggest that perhaps we might slightly modify the Senator's proposed unanimous consent agreement to allow for the fact that I may be unable to be here right at that time.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, we will make it simple. I ask unanimous consent that when this block of time is completed, as outlined by Senator REID, there be an equal amount of time on this side for me or my designee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I yield to the two Senators from New York to use their 10 minutes of time now to speak about the death of Cardinal O'Connor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York, Mr. SCHUMER, is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN CARDINAL O'CONNOR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I will use 5 minutes and then yield to my senior colleague from New York for 5 minutes.

It is with a heavy heart that I rise today to honor the memory of His Eminence, John Cardinal O'Connor. As you know, His Eminence was a man of immense honor and conviction, a man who dedicated his entire life in service to our Nation and the betterment of humanity. He was completely loyal to Catholic doctrine but was able to reach out to New Yorkers of all races, religions, and ethnic and economic backgrounds. His loss is New York's loss, America's loss, and humankind's loss.